A. Interpretation: debaters may not defend implementation of a handgun ban through state or location action. They must defend either federal legislation, an executive order, or a reversal of current decisions through the Supreme Court as long as any of the three result in a legal ban of handguns.

B. Violation: their plan text fiats the fifty states.

C. Standards

1. Utopian fiat- there is no entity capable of forcing all fifty different legislatures to do the exact same thing at the same time. Outweighs on probability, there’s never been a policy passed unanimously by all states at the same time. Real-world decision making comes first- it’s a portable benefit.

**Strait and Wallace 7** [The scope of negative fiat and the logic of decision making. L. Paul Strait George Mason University and Brett Wallace Write: George Washington University.]

Why debate? Some do it for scholarships, some do it for social purposes, and many just believe it is fun. These are certainly all relevant considerations when making the decision to joining the debate team, but as debate theorists they aren’t the focus of our concern. Our concern in finding a framework for debate that educates the largest quantity of students with the highest quality of skills, while at the same time preserving competitive equity. **The ability to make decisions** deriving from discussions, argumentation or debate, is the key skill. It **is the one thing every single one of us will do every day** besides breathing. **Decision making transcends boundaries between categories of learning like “policy education” and “kritik education,**” it makes irrelevant considerations of whether we will eventually be policymakers **and it transcends questions of what substantive content a debate round should contain.** The implication for this analysis is that the critical thinking and argumentative skills offered by real-world decision-making are comparatively greater than any educational disadvantage weighed against them. It is the skills we learn, not the content of our arguments, that can best improve all of our lives. While **policy comparison** skills are going to be learned through debate in one way or another, those **skills are useless if they are not grounded in the** kind of **logic actually used to make decisions.**

2. Limits- their plan means that the aff gets possible ground from political states of affairs in each of the fifty states and relevant territories. Even if I get disad ground- aff has infinite prep time to frontline a specific strategy and the ability to pick a states plan or not. Limits kills fairness since you get a structural prep advantage on the area of debate and educations since I can’t engage with the random advantages you can get offense from.

3. Textuality- **dictionary.com** defines the United States

http://www.dictionary.com/browse/united-states

a republic in the N Western Hemisphere comprising 48 conterminous states, the District of Columbia, and Alaska in North America, and Hawaii in the N Pacific. Conterminous United States, 3,022,387 sq. mi. (7,827,982 sq. km); with Alaska and Hawaii, 3,615,122 sq. mi. (9,363,166 sq. km). Capital: Washington, D.C. Abbreviation: U.S., US.

The aff doesn’t happen in the District of Columbia, only in the fifty states. That’s not T- the “United States” is defined by the entirety of its territories.

Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms 05 US Department of Defense 2005 http://www.thefreedictionary.com/United+States

United States Includes the land area, internal waters, territorial sea, and airspace of the United States, including the following: a. US territories, possessions, and commonwealths; and b. Other areas over which the US Government has complete jurisdiction and control or has exclusive authority or defense responsibility.

Two impacts

A] key to jurisdiction-the ballot asks you to endorse the better debater in the context of the resolution issued by the tournament rules-if you don’t defend the topic then it’s impossible to vote for you, that’s the most important voter.

B] Accuracy comes first-the topicality rule is superior and non uniques your offense.

Nebel 15 Jake Nebel (debate coach his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments) “The Priority of Resolutional Semantics by Jake Nebel” VBriefly February 20th 2015 <http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/> JW 2/20/15

One reason why LDers may be suspicious of my view is because they see topicality as just another theory argument. But unlike other theory arguments, **topicality** involves two “interpretations.” The first is an interpretation, in the ordinary sense of the word, of the resolution or of some part of it. The second **is a *rule***—namely, that **the aff**irmative **must defend the res**olution.[2](http://vbriefly.com/2015/02/20/the-priority-of-resolutional-semantics-by-jake-nebel/#fn2) If we don’t distinguish between these two interpretations, then the negative’s view is merely that the affirmative must defend whatever proposition they think should be debated, not because it is the proposition expressed by the resolution, but rather because it would be good to debate. This failure to see **what is distinctive about** Topicality leads quickly to the pragmatic approach, by ignoring what the interpretation is supposed to be an interpretation *of*. By contrast, **the topicality rule**—i.e., that the affirmative must defend the resolution—**justifies the semantic approach**. This rule is justified by appeals to fairness and education: **it would be unfair to expect the neg**ative **to prep**are **against anything other than the res**olution, because **that is the only mutually acceptable basis for prep**aration; **the educational benefits** that are unique to debate **stem from clash** focused **on a proposition determined beforehand**. The inference to the priority of semantic considerations is simple. Consider the following argument: We ought to debate the resolution. The resolution means X. Therefore, We ought to debate X. The first premise is just the topicality rule. The second premise is that X is the semantically correct interpretation. **Pragmatic considerations** for or against X do not, in themselves, support or deny this second premise. They might **show that it would be better** or worse***if* the resolution meant X, but** **sentences do not** in general **mean what it would be best for them to mean**. At best, pragmatic considerations may show that we should debate some proposition other than the resolution. **They are** (if anything) **reasons to *change* the topic, contrary to the topicality rule**. Pragmatic considerations must, therefore, be weighed against the justifications for the topicality rule, *not* against the semantic considerations: they are objections to the first premise, not the second premise, in the argument above.